

present invention, Claim 29 does not recite an external processor or block. Likewise, Claim 30 has been drafted to explicitly state that the claimed "processor" is "for use with an external processor" so as to make clear that the "external processor" is not a limitation of the claim. Moreover, the "block" of claim 31 is recited as being "operable to receive data and store the data in the memory" but is not required to be operable to "process" information or "determine whether it is necessary to initiate" the processor as is the first processing section recited in claim 1 of U.S. Patent 6,804,791. It is submitted that the removal of these additionally-limiting features from the inventions of claims 1 and 8 of U.S. Patent 6,804,791 would not have been obvious, or alternatively that such removal would not result in the inventions recited in claims 29-31. At least because of the distinctions between claims 29-31 of the present invention and claims 1 and 8 of U.S. Patent 6,804,791 discussed above, it is submitted that the inventions recited in claims 29-31 of the present application would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made in view of the inventions recited in claims 1 and 8 of U.S. Patent 6,804,791.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuaki OSHIMA et al.

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek

Registration No. 41,471

Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
April 6, 2005